

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 1 July 2004. Responsive to the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 are now amended to further clarify their recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner found objectionable the phrase “scissor-like.” As mentioned, Claims 1 and 2 are now amended; and, it is believed that such amendments now obviate the Examiner’s formal concerns under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 as being unpatentable over the prior art shown in Fig. 8 of the subject Patent Application, in view of the Kim reference. In setting forth this rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that the prior art of Fig. 8 fails to disclose any reinforcement rods and adaptation holder, but cited the Kim reference for disclosing such features. From this, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the prior art of Fig. 8 accordingly.

As for Claim 2, the Examiner indicated that the Claim would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection and to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. Accordingly,

Claim 2 is now amended to independent form, incorporating the subject matter of Claim 1 with the informality noted by the Examiner removed. It is believed, therefore, that Claim 2 is now in allowable form.

Claim 1 has also been amended to now more clearly recite a multiple-purpose foldable frame including among its combination of features “linking rod sets each having cross-coupled rods,” a plurality of spaced “posts,” as well as reinforcement rods each “pivoted to a respective second pivot holder of each post.” As Claim 1 now more clearly recites, “at least one of said reinforcement rods” is provided with “an arm coupled to an intermediate portion thereof for support relative to one said post.” Clearly, neither the prior art of Fig. 8 nor the Kim reference discloses the full combination of such features. Note in this regard that the support bars 62 of Kim which the Examiner correlated to Applicant’s reinforcement rods are nowhere provided with any “arm coupled to an intermediate portion thereof for support relative to ... [a] post,” as Claim 1 also now more clearly recites. Kim discloses for its cart frame 100 any such post, let alone an arm used to support an intermediate portion of a support bar 62 relative thereto.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the prior art of Fig. 8 and the cited Kim reference, even when considered together, fail to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicant’s pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application. It is

MR1111-1195

Serial Number: 10/686,650

Reply to Office Action dated 1 July 2004

now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 9/23/2004

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678